



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Vine split at the lower portion of the tube; the slit usually extending through the upper two-thirds of the calyx, the lower portion of the corolla-tube and down to the nectary. All this time I have been on the lookout for the author of these depredations, and only during the past month have I been successful in detecting him at his work.

For several years my suspicion has been resting on *Icterus baltimore*, for I have on a number of occasions seen him fly from a clump of these flowers in such a manner as to make me believe he had been at work on them; but I did not wish to whisper such a report about a bird of such an unusual beauty, unless I knew it to be true. But several weeks since, while sitting concealed by a window, which is within a few feet of a thrifty Trumpet Vine, then in full bloom, I detected a pair of Baltimore Orioles in the act of slitting the flowers as above described and taking the nectar; since then this observation has been repeated several times.—JACOB SCHNECK, *Mt. Carmel, Ill.*

EDITORIAL.

AT THE Washington meeting of the American Association notice was given of an amendment to divide the Section of Biology. Of course this means to separate the zoologists and botanists; and as the matter will be up for discussion and decision at the next meeting, it is just as well for botanists to begin considering its advisability. The notice of amendment was prompted by two considerations: (1) The extremely crowded program, which compelled the cutting down and mutilation of some of the most important zoological and botanical papers, and also entirely prevented in many cases the presentation of papers by some of our most distinguished biologists. (2) The numerous technical papers in each biological division which were unintelligible to the other. The first consideration may possibly be weakened by the fact that there was, at Washington, a conjunction of an unusually large attendance of biologists and an unusually short allowance of time for reading papers. But three days were allowed, four being the usual number. However, the attendance will be more likely to increase than to diminish, and the working days of the association will probably remain those of the Washington meeting. The second consideration is also an important one, for, with the reading of every paper it becomes very apparent that "one-half the world doesn't care how the other half lives." Upon the whole, the GAZETTE is now inclined to favor the amendment, providing such a division will not diminish the in-

terest of the Botanical Club, an exceedingly valuable organization, and one whose informal meetings cannot be duplicated by a Botanical Section of the Association. Even if the division into botanical and zoological sections be made, it will always be desirable to have certain papers of general biological interest read in joint session, a thing commonly provided for in other sections.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Saccardo's *Sylloge Fungorum*.

The enumeration and description of all known fungi, a work of enormous magnitude, was begun a decade or more ago by Prof. P. A. Saccardo, of Padua, Italy. The first volume appeared in 1882, and the eighth and last of the regular enumeration two years ago. The eight, thick, royal octavo volumes contained the description of 31,927 species.

It was to be expected that some species would be overlooked, and that new ones would be constantly added, so that the work is no sooner finished than it needs a supplement. The first number of such a supplement is already issued, and botanists will feel under a special debt of gratitude to the author for the promptness with which it has been prepared.

The *Supplementum Universale* is to consist of two volumes, the first of which bears date of September, 1891, and the second is promised for 1892. The present volume¹ is as thick as the thickest of those which have preceded, and contains descriptions of 4463 species, distributed among six large groups, as follows: Hymenomycetæ 1083, Gasteromycetæ 72, Hypodermeæ (Ustilagineæ and Uredineæ) 249, Phycomycetæ 139, Pyrenomycetæ 2903, and Laboulbeniaceæ 17.

The volumes containing the Pyrenomycetæ were issued in 1882-3, which partly accounts for the great preponderance of species in that group. The Laboulbeniaceæ appeared in the final volume, 1889, with only 15 species, and the 17 additions of the supplement were all derived from the two publications of Dr. Roland Thaxter, and are all American. Thus the largest and earliest published group shows an increase of 47 per cent., and the smallest and latest published group shows an increase of 113 per cent. Even if we take into view the rusts

¹ SACCARDO, P. A.—*Sylloge fungorum omnium hucusque cognitorum*: Vol. IX, *Supplementum universale*, Pars I. pp. 1141. Roy. 8vo. Padova. 1891.—fr. 57.